AIR WAR COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

WORK FORCE OPTIMIZATION

FOR 2025

By

Edward Buckner, GS-14, Army

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: COL Jeffery

8 February 2016

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government, the Department of Defense, or Air University. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.

Biography

GS-14 Edward Buckner attends the Air War College, Air University, Maxwell AFB, AL. A retired Army officer currently employed as a Department of the Army Civilian with the US Army Ordnance School, Training and Doctrine Command. As the Director of the Ordnance Electronics Maintenance Training Department (OEMTD), he supervises over 200 personnel in the execution of training for 12 Initial Entry Training courses and 2 Professional Military Education courses. Mr. Buckner led the integration of commercial certifications into the US Army Ordnance School, and was the proponent lead for the Basic Electronics Maintenance Trainer (BEMT) program. While on active duty he led at numerous supervisory levels, accumulating an in-depth knowledge of Army logistical systems and applications in both garrison and field operations.

Abstract

The workforce represents the most critical component of any organization; this fact is especially true in governmental agencies. There are direct cost associated with untrained employees and turnover. Trained and supported personnel are more efficient and committed to the task accomplishment. In 2008 the US Army began researching the Human Dimension of the workforce and its impact in both peace and wartime environments. In 2015, it released an overarching strategy to address current issues and future challenges regarding work force optimization. This strategy introduce some new concepts while incorporating some existing programs. Prior to this strategy the Department had produced numerous different programs as problems arose, attacking the symptoms and not the overarching issues. Does the Army require unique skills and knowledges of its workforce, beyond its basic technical requirements, in comparison to other Military Services and agencies? Did the other Military services have similar strategies or programs? In researching this question, the Army's Human Dimension Strategy is not unique to the Army and is applicable to the other Military Services and US Government agencies with only minor exceptions. The Army and the Marines face some unique challenges due to the direct interface with local combatants and populations on the battlefield and require enhanced training at junior levels. In general all of the Military Services and US Government Agencies seek similar attributes in leaders; agility, creativity, diversity and innovation. Agencies, including the Military Services, should improve civilian integration, talent management programs, increase attendance to premier public institutions of higher learning, promote overall fitness and continue researching the human dimension for additional improvements. The deciding factor on future battlefields will not be technology, but the ability of the workforce to adapt and apply innovative approaches to the enemy.

Introduction

Since the end of the Cold War, the United States (US) has struggled to define its strategy in an ever-changing world. This has exacerbated the challenge in preparing the workforce to meet requirements in this changing environment. In the 1990s, the Army tried to allocate units to specific theaters, aligning their training to meet specific environmental requirements. This proved to be less than desirable during operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, as units trained for tropical regions were required to deploy to desert areas. During the last decade, the Military Services modified training to support changes occurring in the deployed areas as tactics, techniques and procedures (TTP) changed.[1] Again, this seemed to be only addressing symptoms and not the root problem. Military Services struggle to deal with both civilian and military personnel requirements, with extremely different laws and policies governing their utilization and development. As a new generation of workers entered the workforce, "the millennial", previous training techniques did not produce desired outcomes, adding additional dynamics to the issue. Additionally, as the Department of Defense (DOD) executes a major drawdown in the workforce, it will become critical that the smaller force be able to meet growing requirements with fewer personnel. These challenges were not limited to the military; other US Government agencies face similar requirements in developing their workforce for future requirements. Senior leaders assess that current programs are not working as intended and seek alternate solutions.[2]

One has to question if we are looking at the problem correctly. Is there a definable objective, or should we just accept that the exact need is undefinable? As Robert Gates, retired Secretary of the Defense, stated recently in testimony to the Senate Arms Service Committee, "Our record since Vietnam in predicting where and how we will be engaged militarily next – even a few months out – is perfect: we have never once gotten it right."[3] Even with this

overwhelming fact, DOD and US Government agencies continue to seek the one solution that meets organizational needs for workforce development. Leaders must commit to lifelong learning to meet the future needs of DOD and the Nation.[4] This narrow perspective limits creativity and innovation in methodologies to achieve the desired agile and adaptive workforce. [5]

[6]

      In May 2015, the Army published its "Human Dimensions Strategy" to try to address this growing issue.[7] Instead of focusing on specific traits or skills, the Army accepted the fact that the future is unknown and developed a strategy that would build an adaptive and innovated workforce that would achieve desired results no matter what the future environment brings. This is a significant change for the Army given its history of working more in the realm of absolutes. The development of the strategy took over 9 years to complete, DOD began looking into "Human Performance Optimization" in June 2006. Within that same year General William S. Wallace, Commander Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), stated that if soldiers were required to accomplish more, they would need to improve their performance.[8] In response to this assessment, TRADOC added the Human Dimension to its list of six dimensional studies programmed for that year. In April 2008, TRADOC published the results of the Human Dimensions Study, 2015 - 2024, outlining the requirement not to base training requirements on current operations but to plan to support requirements ranging from humanitarian assistance to major combat.[9] The Army combined its findings with those from DODs research to produce its strategy. Bottom line is that equipment and technology is not the primary reason for battlefield success, it is the people involved in the operation. Innovation and agility are required to ensure the workforce is capable of handling future requirements.[10]

Joint Publication 3.0 requires all Military Services and US Government Agencies to be prepared to support Joint Task Force (JTF) or Joint Interagency Task Force (JITF) for specific operational requirements.[11] One can postulate that having Military Services and Government Agencies achieving similar objectives in optimizing their workforce would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of joint operations.

Thesis

Does the Army require unique education, realistic training and organizational agility to optimize its workforce, beyond basic technical training, in comparison to other Military Services and Government Agencies?

This paper will compare and contrast the Army's Human Dimensions Strategy with requirements for the other Military Services and Government Agencies to determine if the Army has unique requirements. This analysis will use the three lines of effort (LOE) established in the Human Dimension Strategy; Cognitive Dominance, Realistic Training and Institutional Agility in this assessment.[12] It is not the intent of this analysis to determine if the Army is correct in its execution of an education and training strategy, only to identify differences from what other Military Services and agencies are implementing to develop their workforce.

Cognitive Dominance

Cognitive capacity is the ability of an individual to maximize all thinking skills to develop and employ complex mental models and frames of reference to conceptualize, analyze, evaluate, and create solutions to complex problems faced on a daily basis.[13] To dominate in this realm one must optimize their cognitive, physical, and social abilities.[14] An organization maximizes this capability through team development and diversity of the workforce. This must

apply equally throughout the organization and not just focus on the senior levels to gain

maximum return on investment in the workforce.[15] Within the military, this applies to the total

work force; Active, National Guard, Reserve military and civilians personnel.

1. Intellectual Diversity and Capacity to Succeed in Complex Environments

The Military Services approach cognitive training through Professional Military

Education (PME) programs in very similar ways. Each service has specific requirements for

PME attendance, generally based on rank, for all assigned personnel.[16] Diversity is not limited to

cultural, racial or religious factors; it includes different kinds of thinkers even when their

backgrounds may be similar.[17] True success in the future will be the capability to leverage

individual cognitive capabilities in a team environment.[18] The best example of this application is

the ability of Special Forces teams (Seals, Rangers, Green Beret) to execute mission

requirements in extremely ambiguous environments to an extremely high degree of success.[19]

Cognitive diversity does not improve performance when it comes to routine tasks like replacing a

tire on a vehicle. However, when we are dealing with complex tasks or tasks requiring creativity

and innovation or managerial issues, cognitive diversity is a key explanatory variable in levels of

performance.[20] The Military Services gain the majority of their cognitive diversity training

through attendance in Professional Military Education (PME) courses conducted at centralized

education facilities and realistic training exercises. Section 2 will discuss realistic training. Each

Military Service develops PME courses based on their specific needs. Sometimes these courses

include the exchange of military personnel within the Military Services and even foreign military

personnel. The specific course attended is generally determined based on the rank of the

individual student. The fact that the Military Services develop training to support their specific

needs and scheduled based on year group tends to reduce the amount of diversity achieved in

4

training. The diversity of training increases at senior level courses as the involvement of individuals outside the providing service is increased.

The Army's civilian training program differs significantly with those of other Military Services. In line with their strategy, the Army has established the requirement for all civilians to attend Civilian Education System (CES) schools, similar to the military PME, based on the grade of the civilian employee. The Army has adopted a lifelong learning approach for civilian employees that begins with the Acculturation program and continues with the CES program.[21] All Army civilians must complete an online foundation course, followed by mandatory resident attendance of a Basic, Intermediate or Advance Course.[22] All job specialties receive equal distribution from this program, which increases the diversity of the training attended. Upon promotion, the civilian employee is required to complete the level of training required at the new grade. Similarly, the Air Force has developed a centralized website to assist its civilian employees in obtaining developmental training.[23] In addition, the Military Services provides tuition assistance/reimbursement programs on a voluntary basis.[24] [25] [26] The Navy and Marines provide civilian professional training through multiple online courses. This type of course tends to build identity diversity more than cognitive diversity since there are no differing thinking patterns demonstrated or observed during the completion of the course.[27] The Department of Defense (DOD) also executes a Defense Senior Leader Development Program (DSLDP) program that provides civilian diversity among the Military Services.[28]

In comparison to other agencies within the US Government, DOD provides a significant amount of opportunity to build cognitive diversity. No other agency provides internal agency training beyond initial employment training. The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) provides training for US Government agencies through a centralized program on a voluntary

basis.[29] Degree completion and participation in the DOD schools are available through interagency agreements, but on a very limited basis.[30] [31] Since agencies must fund these courses within their limited budgets, a very small percentage of the workforce participate in these training programs. Overall, there are very little programmed cognitive diversity opportunities available outside DOD within the US Government.

OPM should review DOD programs and consider making these programs available for all agencies. DOD should assess the Army's Acculturation and CES programs as well as the Air Force website initiatives and expand them to the other services and agencies within DOD if successful. DOD should ensure adequate funding for development programs that enhance cognitive development across the workforce.

2. Holistic Health and Fitness Programs

There is no one universal definition for holistic health, but there seems to be a common thread which includes the whole (holistic) approach to the mind, body and spirit well-being.[32] The Army defines holistic health and fitness into two components health fitness and physical fitness. Health fitness has four elements health readiness, nutritional fitness, weight management, and sleep and physical fitness consist of two elements general physical fitness and mission physical fitness.[33] In the past Military Services have focused purely on physical conditioning and weight management for military member fitness, even though these elements are only part of the requirements for overall wellness of the individual as defined above. In recent years, Military Services have made significant changes in programs to address the holistic health of military personnel.

Service	Requirements	Events
Air Force[34]	4	1.5-Mile Run Body Composition Crunches Push-ups
Army[35]	3	Push Ups Sit Ups 2-Mile Run
Marines[36]	4	3-Mile Run Abdominal Crunches Flexed-Arm Hang Pull Ups
Navy[37]	3	1.5-Mile Run Curl Ups (Sit Ups) Push Ups

Table 1: Fitness Standards

The Army's current fitness events, in the table above, have a low correlation to the performance of assigned duties and are not strong predictors of successful physical performance on the battlefield or in full spectrum operations.[38] In 2011, the Army began evaluating a new test that better aligns with battlefield tasks but has not yet implemented any change to current standards. The new test is gender neutral; soldiers in combat specialties will have to do specific tasks to certify for inclusion in that field.[39] The Air Force has executed the most significant changes, shifting the responsibility for fitness to the Airmen themselves.[40] Effective in 2013 the Air Force integrated medical screening as part of the termination process for Airmen that do not meet physical standards.[41] In 2015, the Navy executed a change in their program to move from a punitive motivation to more of a health incentive program, but sailors feel the program is actually increasingly punitive.[42] Navy leaders must ensure adequate time as allocated while deployed on ship for Sailors to maintain their fitness. Military Services have increased their training and education in overall wellness, focusing on diet, nutrition and resiliency programs.[43] The success of these programs is still under evaluation. The majority of installation fitness facilities within DOD support physical conditioning only. To incorporate full wellness programs,

the execution of a capital investment program is required to provide other capabilities within

fitness facilities.

Civilian personnel involvement in fitness programs is voluntary since only a few

specialties have physical standards as part of the job description. Military Services have provided

different incentives to motivate civilian employees to participate in health programs.

Service	Incentive	Description
Air Force[44]	3 Hours Per Week, Unlimited Length	Requires supervisor approval and diary of progress
Army[45]	3 Hours Per Week, Maximum 6 Months	Requires supervisor approval and exercise and nutrition training
Marines[46]	3 Hours Per Week, Unlimited Length	Requires supervisor approval and annual fitness education assessment
Navy[47]	3 Hours Per Week, Renewed Qtrly	Requires supervisor approval

Table 2: Civilian Fitness Programs

Overall, the Army's program is the most restrictive in nature but all of the Military

Services have experienced very low participation in these programs. Civilians can attend the

same nutrition and diet training that is available for military personnel, generally on a space

available basis. Online training is available for viewing during duty hours. Civilian fitness is an

individual responsibility and does not reflect on the organizations leaders or employee

evaluations, except those positions that have a physical requirement as part of the position

standards.

Fitness programs within other US Government agencies are limited to specific duty

specialties, mainly within law enforcement, civil and special agents.[48] [49] [50] This is a very low

percentage of the total workforce. No other training or incentives are available for the workforce

beyond personal commitment.

The Army, Navy and the Marines should review the current Air Force fitness program and consider a similar cultural shift to making the service member more responsible for their health and fitness. Holistic health requires a commitment beyond the duty day and requires medical resources to achieve the desired results. The individual service member is the one that ultimately decides if they will maintain a healthy and fit lifestyle, not the commander of a unit. Additionally, DOD needs to standardize civilian programs as outlined in table 2 above. The Army and Marines limit civilians to six-month programs, while the Air Force and Navy programs are unlimited. Since a large portion of the civilian workforce are retired military with lifetime medical coverage, additional investment in improving civilian fitness should reduce medical cost paid by DOD.

3. Decision Making Skills Development

Everyone is required to make decisions and solve problems in their business and personal lives. Most decisions are made quickly and without much thought, but most of us procrastinate or over analyze the more important decisions.[51] Daily all members of a workforce face challenging questions that must be resolved in a professional manner that is in accordance with the organizations values and beliefs.[52] This is especially true within the Military Services. To assist in this requirement each Military Services has developed different processes to reach a logical conclusion, or possible solutions and alternatives. "The U.S. Marine Corps has adopted multiple Military Decision Making Processes (MDMP) similar to the Army's; time determines which decision process to use in making the final decision. The U.S. Air Force uses a rather eclectic mixture of existing approaches to the process. The U.S. Navy, a late entry into the mix, has its own spin on the process, which it calls the Commander's Estimate of the Situation (CES). Each service's approach has merit, and on the surface, problems appear easy to correct."[53] The

Military Services train these approaches during PME training. The challenge is that most of these decision models apply a basic logical systematic flow in reaching alternatives. This is fine if the problems solution can be determined in a systematic manner. Some questions cannot be resolved in this manner and require more of an artistic manner for solutions.[54] This is especially true when dealing with a problem that does not lend itself to a definable single solution. When a logical solution cannot be determined individuals must rely on past experience, organizational norms, ethical and value based guidance. The organizations ethics are a critical component in all decision processes.

Military Services mainly utilize reoccurring online training programs to teach ethics to the workforce. It is a federally mandated annual requirement for all assigned personnel.[55] Some individuals must complete additional training if they are involved in the procurement process, law enforcement or medical field. Online training relies on the motivation of the student to be successful. Due to the fact that the training is normally the same content used in previous years, motivation in completing the training generally deteriorates over time.[56] The Army incorporated additional decision-making and ethical training in its Profession of Arms training program; small groups discuss different situations and ethical solution to the problems.[57] Commanders at every level have incorporated other forms of ethical training to aid in achieving the desired goal.

Other US agencies generally rely on internally developed decision-making models or those commonly used by businesses. The US Government established the Office of Government Ethics (OGE) to provide ethics training to all governmental agencies that did not have the internal capability to execute the training. The online training is similar to the Military Services training program.[58] This program focuses on the ethical training and does not link ethics to a decision making process.

As organizations and the environment become more complex, decision-making requires a more dynamic approach. There may not be a solution to the issue, only the best option of different alternatives.[59] Cognitive diversity, as described above, provide leaders with enhanced cognitive patterns to aid in resolving these complex issues. DOD should continue to enhance the ability of leaders to make acceptable decisions in complex environments through cognitive diversity, higher education, ethical and realistic training. When possible, leaders should involve other members of the workforce when making decisions to aid in individual development and alternative points of view for problem resolution.

Realistic Training within the Military Services and Other Governmental Agencies

Training is a key element to optimizing any workforce, the more realistic the training, the higher the possible return on the investment. Untrained employees are generally unhappy, have a low production value, are inefficient, make mistakes, increase cost through rework, and can cause mission failure.[60] Within combat situations, training can make the difference between life and death. The Military Services rely on training to reduce risk and improve predictability at every level of the organization in both peace and wartime operations. The last decade of war has produced one of the most highly trained military forces in the world.[61] Leaders face the challenge of retaining this level of expertise as the force rotates back to a peacetime environment.

Training Resource Allocations Compared to Pre Iraq and Afghanistan Wars

DOD has experienced a 27% reduction in its budget since 2010, but remains 28% higher than its prewar budget in 2000.[62] As part of the overall funding reduction, DOD is executing an 8% reduction in overall personnel based on 2001 authorizations. Even with these reductions, the Military Services plan to execute training exercises that are above the pre Iraq and Afghanistan

levels.[63] For example, the US Army plans to execute 19 CTC rotations in 2016 in compared to the 17 they executed in 1999.[64] Even with this commitment, Military Services estimate that they will not reach pre 9/11 readiness levels until after 2020.[65] There is continual pressure to reduce the length of training provided in Initial Entry Training (IET) to help offset some of the budget reductions. Projected funding allocation will level-off to above pre-9/11 levels but it will take time for the Military Services to recover from training not executed in the last few years.

Civilian education in the Air Force, Navy and Marines has remained at their pre 9/11 levels. The Army has increased its resource allocation with the introduction of the Civilian Education System (CES), mandating all civilians to complete online and resident training based on grade.[66] This additional education increases the diversity of thinking within the civilian workforce through exposure to cognitive diversity among other members of the workforce.[67] DOD and the Military Services have continued to fund training for civilians to attend premier public schools, Professional Military Education (PME) schools and Military Services War Colleges.

Non-DOD agencies continue to operate at pre 9/11 levels with little impact to their development programs. Agencies can participate in the same PME civilian programs provided within DOD as long as the agency funds attendance.

Military Services should continue to maintain a trained and ready force. DOD must ensure the President and members of Congress are aware of training and readiness impacts based on budget reductions. As individuals with combat experience begin to leave the services, realistic training must reinforce those critical skills necessary for units to succeed in war. DOD needs to increase the number of Joint Exercises between services and when possible Coalition Forces to ensure interoperability and synchronization of forces. These exercises need to go beyond

computer simulations to validate service specific acquisitions capabilities. Multiple domains

should be included to validate emerging concepts and TTPs.

Institutional Agility within the Military Services and Other Governmental Agencies

Change occurs at a rapid pace, any organization that does not keep up with the changing

environment will find itself irrelevant.[68] The Military Services have recently focused on

flattening organizational structures as a way to achieve agility, but this does not always achieve

the desired end state. An organization needs agile leaders that can implement organizational

change, lead teams and engage members in creative thinking activity that will improve the

functionality of the organization.[69] Reducing the organizational structure does not produce agile

leaders; it only reduces the layers of people. If the same process and procedures remain then the

organization has to do more with less, which reduces the organizations agility.[70] To produce

agile leaders the organization must invest in the leader's capability through advanced education

and ensure proper management of the leader's career.[71]

Advanced Education for Military and Civilian Personnel within the Military Services and Agencies

Military Services offer similar programs for military personnel to earn an advanced

degree. Most installations have graduate and undergraduate programs available in government

facilities to entice military personnel to earn a degree. Although there are opportunities for

Service members to seek advanced education on their own time and expense, military life is not

generally conducive to such study. Additionally, based solely on available time between

promotions, many officers opt for graduate degrees from military institutions in lieu of the

broadening opportunities found in civilian higher education. Although trends indicate more

officers are receiving graduate degrees than in previous years, they also reveal that the vast

majority of these degrees are from military institutions.[72] The effect of this on the force is a less intellectually diversified corps of service members in most ranks, which is opposite of the desired objective. DOD recently announced a program to increase the number of officers and enlisted soldiers attending premier civilian universities.[73]

The US Army does provide funding for undergraduate education to the civilian workforce as long as the training supports the assigned duties of the employee. This program significantly limits the ability to earn a degree without funding additional courses with personal funds. Civilians can compete to attend military PME courses to earn a degree, but this is generally restricted to less than 15% of the civilian workforce and requires significant service commitment. Bottom line, on average it is the responsibility of the civilian employee to resource any advanced education degree. Other US Government agencies follow a similar program, relying mainly on the employee to resource any additional education requirements. In general, it is up to the civilian employee to manage their career development below the Senior Executive Service (SES) level within the Military Services. Civilian employees must openly compete against other applicants for developing positions through a highly governed selection process. The Army does provides six-month developmental assignments to selected civilian employees, but the program provides no guarantee of advancement or future utilization of the increased capability. Other US Government agencies provide similar programs, expecting the employee to compete for development opportunities.

DOD should continue to pursue increases in the number of public undergraduate and graduate degrees earned within the workforce. Services should consider allowing selected individuals time to attend Ivy League Institutions for advanced development with continued service agreements. Commanders should have the flexibility to allow service members to attend

local college classes during duty hours when the mission allows. Military Services should conduct a review of internal degree programs to determine the benefit to the organization in comparison with the cost.

Recommendations

The most critical component within the US Government is the workforce.[74] Agencies need to assist each other in optimizing the workforce within the current and projected restrictive budgets. OPM should review DOD programs and consider making these programs available for all agencies. As stated above, the Army and the Air Force have executed lifelong learning approaches for civilian employees.[75] OPM and DOD should assess the success of these programs and expand them to the other agencies and services within DOD if successful.[76] DOD should continue to resource current civilian training programs, which provide an opportunity for selected civilians to attend training at Military Services War Colleges and premier public institutions of higher learning.[77] This will aid in the expansion of diverse thinkers within the workforce.

As illustrated in Table 2 above, DOD should standardize civilian fitness programs across the services. The Air Force and Marines have unlimited programs while the Army and Navy limit the programs to six-months. Since DOD funds a significant amount of the medical cost for the civilian employees, improvements in the overall health and fitness of the workforce should reduce this funding requirement.[78] Holistic fitness is a lifetime commitment and has long-term benefits. DOD should support civilians who demonstrate a commitment to holistic health by providing additional incentives for involvement in the program, but retain clearly established criteria to measure success of the individuals enrolled.

The Army, Navy and Marines should review the current Air Force fitness program and commit to investing more effort beyond the physical aspects of health and fitness. Holistic health and fitness requires a commitment from the individual beyond command directed task, to ensure proper nutrition and wellness during non-duty hours. This requires a change in the culture that shifts the total responsibility for health and fitness to the individual and not commanders. The current Air Force program is an example for other services and agencies to emulate, to include the involvement of medical personnel at the unit level for individual evaluation.[79] Expand the use of social and directed media capabilities to educate all employees on overall health and fitness. Services should execute a capital investment program to expand capabilities within fitness facilities, diversifying available programs to include multiple options in fitness development.

Realistic training is key to maintaining a trained and ready force. DOD should ensure the President and Congress understand the impacts on readiness and training based on budget reductions. DOD should increase the number of Joint and Coalition Exercises to ensure interoperability and synchronization. These exercises need to go beyond computer simulations to validate true capabilities in multiple environments. These exercises should include multiple domains to validate emerging concepts and TTPs.

DOD should increase the number of public undergraduate and graduate degrees; both officers and enlisted could benefit from this program. Fund programs that allow selected service members to attend public university's fulltime, as part of their leader development, with continual service agreements. This would benefit both the Military Services and the civilian schools, as both would gain from the interaction of the military experiences within the classrooms. Current operational requirements do not afford most service members to complete public degrees during non-duty hours, even though they are available. Commanders should

allowed attendance to local college classes during duty hours if the mission is not negatively impacted. Execute a review of current military degree programs to determine their utility. Current programs generate officers with multiple graduate degrees; it is questionable if multiple degrees improve the capability of the officer.

Conclusion

Optimizing the workforce is critical to all agencies across the US Government and builds trust in the US population on resource utilization. Specifically within DOD, success on the battlefield in the future will require both highly creative and agile leaders able to adapt to changing environments and roles of responsibility. Developing and maintaining a workforce to meet this need will require continual investment in the cognitive, physical and social components of every employee. As demonstrated by the research above, the Army's Human Dimension Strategy is not unique to the Army and is applicable to the other Military Services and US Government agencies with only minor exceptions. The Air Force Human Capital Annex and Army strategy are very similar in scope and intent, while the Navy and Marine Corps strategies highlight some components of the Army strategy.[80] [81] [82] The Army and the Marines face some unique challenges due to the direct interface with local combatants and populations on the battlefield and require enhanced training at junior levels. The key themes in the Military Services programs is the need for creative, agile and innovative leaders. Training adaptability in personnel to function in uncertain environments requires exposure to uncomfortable situations, building resiliency in the employee to overcome these challenges. Through these efforts, the employee becomes a greater resource for the organizations. Military Services need to continue innovations in training, education, and leader development to succeed in the future.

Notes

1 Carl M. Bradly 2004. "Operation Iraqi Freedom." *Challenges For Rapid Manuevers And Joint C4ISR Integration And Interoperability.* Newport: Naval War College, September 2.

2 Frank Hoffman and Michael C. Hoffman. 2013. "Joint Force 2020 and the Human Domain: Time for a New Conceptual Framework." Small Wars Journal 1 - 13.

3 Robert Gates. 2015. "Senate Arms Service Committee Testimony." October 21, 2015. Washington, DC: Department of Defense. pg 6.

4 United States Army. 2006. "FM 6-22." Army Leadership Competent, Confident, and Agile. Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, October. Pg. 2-4

5 United States Air Force. 2015. Human Capital Annex to the USAF Strategic Master Plan. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: United States Air Force.

6 United States Army. 2015. The Army Human Dimension Strategy 2015. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army.

7 Ibid

8 Defense Science Board. 2009. Understand Human Dynamics. Report, Washington, DC: Department of Defense, pg viii.

9 United States Army. 2014. TRADOC Pamphlet 525-3-7 The U.S. Army Human Dimension Concept. Training Pamplet, Fort Eustis: US Army Training and Doctrine Command.

10 David Vergun. 2013. Army exploring 'human dimension'. February 4. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.army.mil/article/95675/Army_exploring__human_dimension_/.

11 Joint Chief of Staff. 2011. "Joint Publication 3.0." Joint Operations. Washington, DC: Joint Publishing, August 11. Pg. IV-7

12 United States Army. 2015. The Army Human Dimension Strategy 2015. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army. pg 7.

13 James Browning. 2013. "Leading at the Strategic Level in an Uncertain World." 46-50. Washington: Dwight D. Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy National Defense University.

14 United States Army. 2015. The Army Human Dimension Strategy 2015. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army. pg 8.

15 Patrick Wright, Gary McMahan and AbaGail McWilliams,. 1993. "Human Resources and Sustained Competetive Advantage." A Resource Based Prespective. Los Angeles: Center for Effective Organizations, November. Pg. 23

16 Joan Johnson-Freese. 2013. Educating America's Military. New York, NY: Routledge Inc. Pg. 4

17 Steve Denning. 2012. Why Is Diversity Vital For Innovation? January 16. Accessed January 23, 2016. http://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2012/01/16/why-is-diversity-vital-for-innovation/#790a046c4e7c.

18 Leslie DeChurch, and Jessica Mesmer-Magnus. 2010. "The Cognitive Underpinnings of Effective Teamwork: A Meta-Analysis." Journal of Applied Psychology 22. Pg.1

19 Nick Turse and Tom Dispatch. 2015. Iraq, Afghanistan and Other Special Ops 'Successes' . October 26. Accessed January 9, 2016. http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/iraq_afghanistan_and_other_special_ops_successes_20151 026.

20 United States Army Combined Arms Center. 2014. A Framework for Optimizing Human Performance. White Paper, Fort Leavenworth: United States Army Combined Arms Center. pg 14.

21 United States Army TRADOC. 2015. Civilian Acculturation. February 6. Accessed December 11, 2015. http://www.tradoc.army.mil/dcspil/Acculturation/index.asp.

22 United States Army. 2015. Army Civilian Training and Leadership Development. December 1. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.civiliantraining.army.mil/leader/Pages/Policy.aspx.

23 Ira C. Eaker Center for Professional Development. 2014. Air Force Launches Enhanced Civilian Development Site. February 12. Accessed January 30, 2016. http://www.af.mil/News/ArticleDisplay/tabid/223/Article/473330/air-force-launches-enhanced-civilian-development-site.aspx.

24 United States Air Force, HQ AF/DPDE. 2015. "Employee Training And Development." AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 36-401. Washington, DC: US Air Force, April 21.

25 Civilian Personnel Advisory Center (CPAC). n.d. "Employee Handbook." Employee Handbook. Fort Polk, Louisiana: Department of the Army. Pg. 27

26 United States Navy. 2014. The Benefits of Working for the Department of the Navy. April 23. Accessed January 23, 2016. http://www.usna.edu/HRO/_files/documents/Public%20-%20Docs/benefits/CBC12800-24.pdf.

27 Steve Denning. 2012. Why Is Diversity Vital For Innovation? January 16. Accessed January 23, 2016. http://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2012/01/16/why-is-diversity-vital-for-innovation/#790a046c4e7c.

28 DSLDP Program Staff. n.d. Defense Senior Leader Development Program (DSLDP). Accessed December 5, 2015. https://dodhrinfo.cpms.osd.mil/Directorates/HRSPAS/Leadership-Learning-and-Development/Pages/DSLDP.aspx.

29 Office of Personnel Management. 2015. Center for Leadership Development. September 30. Accessed September 30, 2015. https://leadership.opm.gov/index.aspx.

30 Department of Justice. 2015. Employee Benefits. March 27. Accessed January 9, 2016. http://www.justice.gov/usao-edmi/jobs/employee-benefits.

31 Defense Acquisition University. n.d. Eligibility & Course Registration. Accessed January 9, 2016. http://www.dau.mil/faq/pages/Eligibility.aspx.

32 Michelle Toole. n.d. What is Holistic Health? Accessed January 23, 2016. http://www.healthy-holistic-living.com/definition-of-holistic-health.html.

33 United States Army. 2014. TRADOC Pamphlet 525-3-7 The U.S. Army Human Dimension Concept. Training Pamplet, Fort Eustis: US Army Training and Doctrine Command.

34 Stew Smith. n.d. USAF Fitness Program. Accessed November 30, 2015. http://www.military.com/military-fitness/air-force-fitness-requirements/air-force-fitness-program.

35 Stew Smith. n.d. Army Physical Fitness Program. Accessed December 13, 2015. http://www.military.com/military-fitness/army-fitness-requirements/army-physical-fitness-program.

36 Stew Smith. n.d. Marine Corps Physical Fitness Test. Accessed December 13, 2015. http://www.military.com/military-fitness/marine-corps-fitness-requirements/usmc-physical-fitness-test.

37 Stew Smith. n.d. Navy Physical Readiness Test (PRT) Overview. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.military.com/military-fitness/navy-fitness-requirements/navy-basic-training-pft.

38 Kelly Schloesser. 2011. TRADOC revises Army Physical Fitness Test. February 28. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.army.mil/article/52548/tradoc-revises-army-physical-fitness-test/.

39 Hugh Lessig. 2013. Moving Toward a 'Gender-Neutral' Army. March 25. Accessed December 11, 2015. http://www.military.com/daily-news/2013/03/25/moving-toward-a-gender-neutral-army.html.

40 49th Wing Public Affairs. 2014. Health and fitness program transition, goal remains the same. August 27. Accessed January 23, 2016. http://www.holloman.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123422702.

41 United States Air Force. 2013. "AFI 36-2905 ." Fitness Program. Washington, DC: United States Air Force, October 21.

42 Steven Beardsley. 2015. As Sailors Await New Physical Fitness Rules, 'Tape-In' Debate Smolders. June 23. Accessed December 11, 2015. http://www.military.com/daily-news/2015/06/23/as-sailors-await-new-physical-fitness-rules-tape-in-debate.html.

43 S Amersonzavala and Kelly Schloesser. 2010. Soldier Athlete Initiative. July 30. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.army.mil/article/43074/new-training-initiative-prepares-soldiers-as-athletes.

44 Angelia Revada. 2012. Civilian Health and Wellness Program Offers Wide Array of Services . January 25. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.edwards.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123287224.

45 United States Army Medical Department. n.d. Army Civilian Wellness Programs . Accessed December 13, 2015. http://phc.amedd.army.mil/topics/healthyliving/al/Pages/ArmyCivilianWellnessPrograms.aspx.

46 United States Marine Corps Civilian Human Resources. n.d. Civilian Fitness (CIVFIT) Program. Accessed December 13, 2015. http://www.29palms.marines.mil/Offices/CivilianHumanResources/ProgramsServices/CivilianFitness.aspx.

47 United States Navy. 2013. Health and Wellness for Civilian Employees. Policy, Great Lakes: Naval Service Training Command.

48 United States Department of State. 2012. 12 FAM 040 DS Fitness Programs. Policy, Washington, DC: Department of State.

49 United States Department of Justice. n.d. "Drug Enforcement Administration." Physical Task Training. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

50 United States Department of Agriculture. n.d. Health and Wellness. Accessed January 23, 2016. http://www.dm.usda.gov/employ/worklife/wellness/index.htm.

51 Vaughn, Robert. 2010. Decision Making Training . Lewiston, NY: ASTD Press.

52 Barrett Values Centre . 2016. Values-Based Decision-Making. Accessed January 29, 2016. http://tnlp.valuescentre.com/pages/leading-self/internal-cohesion/values-based-decision-making.php.

53 Colonel Joseph Anderson, Colonel Nathan K. Slate. 2003. "The Case for a Joint Military Decisionmaking Process." Military Review 11-19.

54 Harvard Business Review. 2008. Strategy as a Wicked Problem. May. Accessed January 29, 2016. https://hbr.org/2008/05/strategy-as-a-wicked-problem.

55 Cornell University Law School. n.d. 5 CFR 2638.705 - Annual Ethics Training For Other Employees. Accessed February 7, 2016. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/5/2638.705.

56 Doug Valentine,. 2002. Distance Learning: Promises, Problems, and Possibilities . Accessed January 30, 2016. http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall53/valentine53.html.

57 United States Army Combined Arms Center. 2014. The Army Ethic White Paper. Review, Fort Eustis: Center for the Army Profession and Ethic.

58 United States Government. n.d. U.S. Office of Government Ethics. Accessed December 11, 2015. http://www.oge.gov.

59 Horst W Rittel and Melvin M. Webber. 1973. "Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning." Policy Science #4 155 - 169.

60 Brian Benton. 2014. Importance of Employee Training: 6 Reasons Why it Saves You Money. September 3. Accessed December 13, 2015. http://lineshapespace.com/importance-of-employee-training/.

61 John A. Nagl. 2012. In the Aftermath: Ten Years of War and Change. Accessed January 30, 2016. http://usoonpatrol.org/archives/2012/02/08/in-the-aftermath-ten-years-of.

62 Comptroller. 2015. Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request. Report, Washington, DC: Department of Defense.

63 Comptroller. 2015. United States Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request Overview. Report, Washington, DC: Department of Defense.

64 U.S. Army Center of Military History . 2015. Fiscal Year 1999. May 7. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://history.army.mil/html/books/DAHSUM/1999/ch4.html#4c.

65 Jim Talent and Lindsey Neas. 2015. Military Readiness and Defense Modernization. September 28. Accessed January 30, 2016. https://www.aei.org/publication/military-readiness-and-defense-modernization/.

66 United States Army. 2015. Army Civilian Training and Leadership Development. December 1. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.civiliantraining.army.mil/leader/Pages/Policy.aspx.

67 Henry O'Lawrence. 2016. Managing Workforce Development in the 21st Century. Santa Rosa: Informing Science Press.

68 John P Kotter. 2012. Accelerate! November. Accessed January 30, 2016. https://hbr.org/2012/11/accelerate.

69 John P. Kotter. 2012. Leading Change. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press. Pg. 53 - 86

70 Steven R Block. 2004. Why Nonprofits Fail. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

71 John P. Kotter, 2012. Leading Change. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press. Pg. 169 - 194

72 Under Secretary of Defense. 2015. Future of the Force. Proposal, Washngton, DC: Department of Defense.

73 Andrew Tilghman. 2015. DoD plans to send more officers to civilian grad schools. August 25. Accessed December 2, 2015. http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/benefits/education/2015/08/20/graduate-school-proposals/32063579/.

74 United States Air Force. 2004. "AFDD 1-1." Leadership and Force Development. Washington, DC: US Air Force, February 18.

75 Office of Personnel Management (OPM). n.d. Training and Development. Accessed January 30, 2016. https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/training-and-development/.

76 Department of Defense. 2013. "DODI 1400.25." DoD Civilian Personnel Management System: Training, Education and Personal Development . Washington, DC: Department of Defense, September 25. Accessed 2016.

77 DSLDP Program Staff. n.d. Defense Senior Leader Development Program (DSLDP). Accessed December 5, 2015. https://dodhrinfo.cpms.osd.mil/Directorates/HRSPAS/Leadership-Learning-and-Development/Pages/DSLDP.aspx.

78 Tyrone C. Marshall, SFC. 2015. DoD Civilian Personnel Chief Discusses Future Force. June 9. Accessed February 7, 2016. http://www.defense.gov/News-Article-View/Article/604802/dod-civilian-personnel-chief-discusses-future-force.

79 United States Air Force. 2013. "AFI 36-2905 ." Fitness Program. Washington, DC: United States Air Force, October 21.

80 United States Air Force. 2015. Human Capital Annex to the USAF Strategic Master Plan. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: United States Air Force.

81 United States Navy. 2015. A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: United States Navy.

82 United States Marine Corps. 2015. Vision and Strategy 2025. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: United States Marine Corps.

.

Bibliography

49th Wing Public Affairs. 2014. Health and fitness program transition, goal remains the same. August 27. Accessed January 23, 2016. http://www.holloman.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123422702.

Amersonzavala, S, and Kelly Schloesser. 2010. Soldier Athlete Initiative. July 30. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.army.mil/article/43074/new-training-initiative-prepares-soldiers-as-athletes.

Baillie, Amber. 2014. Bringing character, diversity to life: Academy hosts Air Force leadership summit. July 11. Accessed November 21, 2015. http://www.af.mil/News/ArticleDisplay/tabid/223/Article/486155/bringing-character-diversity-to-life-academy-hosts-air-force-leadership-summit.aspx.

Barrett Values Centre . 2016. Values-Based Decision-Making. Accessed January 29, 2016. http://tnlp.valuescentre.com/pages/leading-self/internal-cohesion/values-based-decision-making.php.

Beardsley, Steven. 2015. As Sailors Await New Physical Fitness Rules, 'Tape-In' Debate Smolders. June 23. Accessed December 11, 2015. http://www.military.com/daily-news/2015/06/23/as-sailors-await-new-physical-fitness-rules-tape-in-debate.html.

Benton, Brian. 2014. Importance of Employee Training: 6 Reasons Why it Saves You Money. September 3. Accessed December 13, 2015. http://lineshapespace.com/importance-of-employee-training/.

Block, Steven R. 2004. Why Nonprofits Fail. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bradly, Carl M. 2004. "Operation Iraqi Freedom." Challenges For Rapid Manuevers And Joint C4ISR Integration And Interoperability. Newport: Naval War College, September 2.

Browning, James. 2013. "Leading at the Strategic Level in an Uncertain World." 46-50. Washington: Dwight D. Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy National Defense University.

Civilian Personnel Advisory Center (CPAC). n.d. "Employee Handbook." Employee Handbook. Fort Polk, Louisiana: Department of the Army.

Colonel Joseph Anderson, Colonel Nathan K. Slate. 2003. "The Case for a Joint Military Decisionmaking Process." Military Review 11-19.

Comptroller. 2015. Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request. Report, Washington, DC: Department of Defense.

Comptroller. 2015. United States Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request Overview. Report, Washington, DC: Department of Defense.

Cornell University Law School. n.d. 5 CFR 2638.705 - Annual Ethics Training For Other Employees. Accessed February 7, 2016. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/5/2638.705.

DeChurch, Leslie, and Jessica Mesmer-Magnus. 2010. "The Cognitive Underpinnings of Effective Teamwork: A Meta-Analysis." Journal of Applied Psychology 22.

Defense Acquisition University. n.d. Eligibility & Course Registration. Accessed January 9, 2016. http://www.dau.mil/faq/pages/Eligibility.aspx.

Defense Science Board. 2009. Understand Human Dynamics. Report, Washington, DC: Department of Defense, 144.

Dempsey, General Martin, interview by Interview on Face the Nation. 2012. 37th Chief of Staff of the Army (January 8).

Denning, Steve. 2012. Why Is Diversity Vital For Innovation? January 16. Accessed January 23, 2016. http://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2012/01/16/why-is-diversity-vital-for-innovation/#790a046c4e7c.

Department of Defense. 2013. 2013 Demographics Report. Report, Washington, DC: Department of Defense.

Department of Defense. 2013. "DODI 1400.25." DoD Civilian Personnel Management System: Training, Education and Personal Development . Washington, DC: Department of Defense, September 25. Accessed 2016.

Department of Justice. n.d. "Drug Enforcement Administration." Physical Task Training. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Department of Justice. 2015. Employee Benefits. March 27. Accessed January 9, 2016. http://www.justice.gov/usao-edmi/jobs/employee-benefits.

United States Department of State. 2012. 12 FAM 040 DS Fitness Programs. Policy, Washington, DC: Department of State.

DSLDP Program Staff. n.d. Defense Senior Leader Development Program (DSLDP). Accessed December 5, 2015. https://dodhrinfo.cpms.osd.mil/Directorates/HRSPAS/Leadership-Learning-and-Development/Pages/DSLDP.aspx.

Felix, Kevin M. 2011. A Case for Human Dimension Training: Decision Science and Its Potential for Improved Soldier Resilience and Decisionmaking at Every Level. Case Study, Arlington: The Institute of Land Warfare Association of the United States Army.

Gates, Robert M. 2008. Secretary of Defense Gates' Speech at West Point. April 21. Accessed September 14, 2015. http://www.cfr.org/world/secretary-defense-gates-speech-west-point/p16086.

Gates, Robert. 2015. "Senate Arms Service Committee Testimony." October 21, 2015. Washington, DC: Department of Defense. 28.

Harvard Business Review. 2008. Strategy as a Wicked Problem. May. Accessed January 29, 2016. https://hbr.org/2008/05/strategy-as-a-wicked-problem.

Hoffman, Frank, and Michael C. Hoffman. 2013. "Joint Force 2020 and the Human Domain: Time for a New Conceptual Framework." Small Wars Journal 1 - 13.

Ira C. Eaker Center for Professional Development. 2014. Air Force Launches Enhanced Civilian Development Site. February 12. Accessed January 30, 2016. http://www.af.mil/News/ArticleDisplay/tabid/223/Article/473330/air-force-launches-enhanced-civilian-development-site.aspx.

Johnson-Freese, Joan. 2013. Educating America's Military. New York, NY: Routledge Inc.

Joint Chief of Staff. 2011. "Joint Publication 3.0." Joint Operations. Washington, DC: Joint Publishing, August 11.

Kane, Tim. 2012. Bleeding Talent. New York: Palgrave McMillian.

Kotter, John P. 2012. Accelerate! November. Accessed January 30, 2016. https://hbr.org/2012/11/accelerate.

Kotter, John P. 2012. Leading Change. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Lessig, Hugh. 2013. Moving Toward a 'Gender-Neutral' Army. March 25. Accessed December 11, 2015. http://www.military.com/daily-news/2013/03/25/moving-toward-a-gender-neutral-army.html.

Marine Corps Civilian Human Resources. n.d. Civilian Fitness (CIVFIT) Program. Accessed December 13, 2015. http://www.29palms.marines.mil/Offices/CivilianHumanResources/ProgramsServices/CivilianFitness.aspx.

Marshall, Tyrone C. SFC. 2015. DoD Civilian Personnel Chief Discusses Future Force. June 9. Accessed February 7, 2016. http://www.defense.gov/News-Article-View/Article/604802/dod-civilian-personnel-chief-discusses-future-force.

Nagl, John A. 2012. In the Aftermath: Ten Years of War and Change. Accessed January 30, 2016. http://usoonpatrol.org/archives/2012/02/08/in-the-aftermath-ten-years-of.

Nolan, Barbara A. Bicksler and Lisa G. 2009. Recruiting an All-Volunteer Force: The Need for Sustained Investment in Recruiting Resources—An Update. Analysis, Arlington: Strategic Analysis, Inc.

Office of Personnel Management (OPM). n.d. Training and Development. Accessed January 30, 2016. https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/training-and-development/.

Office of Personnel Management. 2015. Center for Leadership Development. September 30. Accessed September 30, 2015. https://leadership.opm.gov/index.aspx.

O'Lawrence, Henry. 2016. Managing Workforce Development in the 21st Century. Santa Rosa: Informing Science Press.

Quora, Edmond Lau. 2013. Why And Where Is Teamwork Important? January 23. Accessed December 13, 2015. http://www.forbes.com/sites/quora/2013/01/23/why-and-where-is-teamwork-important/.

Revada, Angelia. 2012. Civilian Health and Wellness Program Offers Wide Array of Services. January 25. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.edwards.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123287224.

Rittel, Horst W., and Melvin M. Webber. 1973. "Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning." Policy Science #4 155 - 169.

Schloesser, Kelly. 2011. TRADOC revises Army Physical Fitness Test. February 28. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.army.mil/article/52548/tradoc-revises-army-physical-fitness-test/.

Smith, Stew. n.d. Army Physical Fitness Program. Accessed December 13, 2015. http://www.military.com/military-fitness/army-fitness-requirements/army-physical-fitness-program.

Smith, Stew. n.d. Marine Corps Physical Fitness Test. Accessed December 13, 2015. http://www.military.com/military-fitness/marine-corps-fitness-requirements/usmc-physical-fitness-test.

Smith, Stew. n.d. Navy Physical Readiness Test (PRT) Overview. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.military.com/military-fitness/navy-fitness-requirements/navy-basic-training-pft.

Smith, Stew. n.d. USAF Fitness Program. Accessed November 30, 2015. http://www.military.com/military-fitness/air-force-fitness-requirements/air-force-fitness-program.

Stephen J. Gerras, Leonard Wong, Charles D. Allen. 2008. Organizational Culture: Applying: A Hybrid Model to the U.S. Army. Research Paper, U.S. Army War College.

Talent, Jim, and Lindsey Neas. 2015. Military Readiness and Defense Modernization. September 28. Accessed January 30, 2016. https://www.aei.org/publication/military-readiness-and-defense-modernization/.

Tilghman, Andrew. 2015. DoD plans to send more officers to civilian grad schools. August 25. Accessed December 2, 2015. http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/benefits/education/2015/08/20/graduate-school-proposals/32063579/.

Toole, Michelle. n.d. What is Holistic Health? Accessed January 23, 2016. http://www.healthy-holistic-living.com/definition-of-holistic-health.html.

Turse, Nick, and Tom Dispatch. 2015. Iraq, Afghanistan and Other Special Ops 'Successes' . October 26. Accessed January 9, 2016. http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/iraq_afghanistan_and_other_special_ops_successes_20151026.

Under Secretary of Defense. 2015. Future of the Force. Proposal, Washngton, DC: Department of Defense.

United States Air Force. 2004. "AFDD 1-1." Leadership and Force Development. Washington, DC: US Air Force, February 18.

United States Air Force. 2013. "Air Force Instruction 36-2905." Fitness Program. Washington, DC: United States Air Force, October 21.

United States Air Force. 2015. Human Capital Annex to the USAF Strategic Master Plan. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: United States Air Force.

United States Air Force. 2015. Strategic Posture Annex to the USAF Strategic Master Plan. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: United States Air Force.

United States Air Force. 2015. USAF Strategic Master Plan. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: United States Air Force.

United States Air Force, HQ AF/DPDE. 2015. "Employee Training And Development." AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 36-401. Washington, DC: US Air Force, April 21.

United States Army. 2015. Army Civilian Training and Leadership Development. December 1. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.civiliantraining.army.mil/leader/Pages/Policy.aspx.

United States Army Center of Military History. 2015. Fiscal Year 1999. May 7. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://history.army.mil/html/books/DAHSUM/1999/ch4.html#4c.

United States Army Combined Arms Center. 2014. A Framework for Optimizing Human Performance. White Paper, Fort Leavenworth: United States Army Combined Arms Center.

United States Army Combined Arms Center. 2014. The Army Ethic White Paper. Review, Fort Eustis: Center for the Army Profession and Ethic.

United States Army. 2006. "FM 6-22." Army Leadership Competent, Confident, and Agile. Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, October.

United States Army Medical Department. n.d. Army Civilian Wellness Programs. Accessed December 13, 2015. http://phc.amedd.army.mil/topics/healthyliving/al/Pages/ArmyCivilianWellnessPrograms.aspx.

United States Army TRADOC. 2015. Civilian Acculturation. February 6. Accessed December 11, 2015. http://www.tradoc.army.mil/dcspil/Acculturation/index.asp.

United States Army. 2014. TRADOC Pamphlet 525-3-7 The U.S. Army Human Dimension Concept. Training Pamplet, Fort Eustis: US Army Training and Doctrine Command.

United States Army Training and Doctrine Command. 2014. "The U.S. Army Human Dimension Concept." The U.S. Army Human Dimension Concept. Fort Eustis, Virginia: Department of the Army, May 21.

United States Army, United States Marine Corps, and the United States Special Operations Command. 2013. "Strategic Landpower Winning the Clash of Wills." Strategic Landpower White Paper. October 28. Accessed September 4, 2015. http://www.arcic.army.mil/app_Documents/Strategic-Landpower-White-Paper-28OCT2013.pdf.

United States Department of Agriculture. n.d. Health and Wellness. Accessed January 23, 2016. http://www.dm.usda.gov/employ/worklife/wellness/index.htm.

United States Department of the Army. 2014. Army Vision - Force 2025. White Paper, Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army.

United States Department of the Army. 2015. The Army Human Dimension Strategy 2015. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army.

United States Government. n.d. U.S. Office of Government Ethics. Accessed December 11, 2015. http://www.oge.gov.

United States Marine Corps. 2015. Expeditionary Force 21. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: United States Marine Corps.

United States Marine Corps. 2015. Vision and Strategy 2025. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: United States Marine Corps.

United States Navy. 2015. A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower. Strategy, Washington, D.C.: United States Navy.

United States Navy. 2013. Health and Wellness for Civilian Employees. Policy, Great Lakes: Naval Service Training Command.

United States Navy. 2014. The Benefits of Working for the Department of the Navy. April 23. Accessed January 23, 2016. http://www.usna.edu/HRO/_files/documents/Public%20-%20Docs/benefits/CBC12800-24.pdf.

United States Office of Personnel Management. n.d. Center for Leadership Development. Accessed January 9, 2016. https://leadership.opm.gov/index.aspx.

Valentine, Doug. 2002. Distance Learning: Promises, Problems, and Possibilities . Accessed January 30, 2016. http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall53/valentine53.html.

Vaughn, Robert. 2010. Decision Making Training . Lewiston, NY: ASTD Press.

Vergun, David. 2013. Army Exploring 'Human Dimension'. February 4. Accessed December 12, 2015. http://www.army.mil/article/95675/Army_exploring__human_dimension_/.

Wright, Patrick, Gary McMahan, and Abagail McWilliams. 1993. "Human Resources and Sustained Competetive Advantage." A Resource Based Prespective. Los Angeles: Center for Effective Organizations, November.